

## REMARKS

Applicant has studied the Office Action dated October 2, 2006. Claims 1-31, 33 and 34 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 13-15, 25-27, 31 and 34 have been amended and claim 32 has been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 17 and 31 are independent claims. No new matter has been added as the amendments have support in the specification as originally filed.

It is submitted that the application, as amended is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

### Amendments to Specification

With this paper, amendments have been made to the specification at paragraphs 0018, 0044, 0045, 0047, 0088-0093 and 0098 to correct typographical errors. No new matter has been added by these amendments, which are not related to patentability.

### Amendments to Drawings

With this paper, amendments have been made to Fig. 12 to correct a typographical error.

### Amendments to the Claims

Claims 4, 6, 8, 13-15, 25-27 and 34 have been amended to correct typographical or grammatical errors or to more clearly disclose the invention. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments have support in the application as originally filed and are not related to patentability.

### § 102 Rejections

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Henderson et al. ("Henderson" U.S. Patent No. 7,006,004). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

It is respectfully noted that a proper rejection for anticipation under § 102 requires complete identity of invention. The claimed invention, including each element thereof as recited in the claims, must be disclosed or embodied, either expressly or inherently, in a single reference. Scripps Clinic & Research Found. v. Genentech Inc., 927 F.2d 1565, 1576, 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001, 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1991); Standard Havens Prods., Inc. v. Gencor Indus., Inc., 953 F.2d 1360, 1369, 21 U.S.P.Q.2d 1321, 1328 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

With this paper, independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate allowable subject matter indicated in claim 32 by the Examiner, with claim 32 canceled without prejudice. Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 31 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Meehan et al. ("Meehan" U.S. Patent No. 6,950477). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

With this paper, independent claim 31 has been amended to incorporate allowable subject matter indicated in claim 32 by the Examiner, with claim 32 canceled without prejudice. Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that independent claim 31, as well as claim 34, which depends from claim 31, are in condition for allowance.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant graciously acknowledges the Examiner's allowance of claims 17-30 and the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2-16, 32 and 33. The allowable subject matter of claim 32 has been incorporated into independent claims 1 and 31 and claim 32 has been canceled without prejudice. Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that claims 2-16, which depend from claim 1, and claim 33, which depends from claim 31, are in condition for allowance given their dependence from an allowable claim.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-31, 33 and 34 of the present application are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as originally filed, are requested.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka

Date: January 2, 2007

By:   
Lew Edward V. Macapagal  
Registration No. 55,416  
Attorney for Applicant

Customer No. 035884

Enclosure: Substitute FIG. 12